

REMARKS

The Office Action dated June 28, 2005 has been carefully reviewed and the foregoing amendment and following remarks have been made in consequence thereof.

Claims 3-8, 11-13, 16-21, and 24-30 are pending in this application after entry of this Amendment. Claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 14, 15, 22, and 23 stand rejected. Claims 3-8, 11, 16-21, and 24 stand objected to. Claims 12, 13, 25, and 26 have been allowed. Claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 14, 15, 22, and 23 have been cancelled.

Applicant believes that there are no fees needed at this time. However, a fee calculation sheet is provided with a conditional authorization to charge the referenced deposit account any necessary fees.

The rejection of Claims 1, 2, 9, 14, 15, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Harman (U.S. 5,406,479) is respectfully traversed.

This rejection no longer applies to Claims 1, 2, 9, 14, 15, and 22, which have been cancelled.

For the above reason, it is requested that the rejection of Claims 1, 2, 9, 14, 15, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Harman be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 1, 2, 9, 14, 15, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Silver (U.S. 5,889,833) is respectfully traversed.

This rejection no longer applies to Claims 1, 2, 9, 14, 15, and 22, which have been cancelled.

For the above reason, it is requested that the rejection of Claims 1, 2, 9, 14, 15, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Silver be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 10 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Waggener et al. (U.S. 5,128,864) is respectfully traversed.

This rejection no longer applies to Claims 10 and 23, which have been cancelled.

For the above reason, it is requested that the rejection of Claims 10 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Waggener et al. be withdrawn.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the allowance of Claims 12, 13, 25, and 26.

The objection to Claims 3-8, 11-13, and 16-21 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim is respectfully traversed.

In accordance with the reasons given for the indication of allowable subject matter, it is believed that the list of claims in this objection is in error, and that the object was instead intended to apply to Claims 3-8, 11, 16-21, and 24. Notably, independent Claim 12 and Claim 13 were indicated as containing allowable subject matter, and the Office recites the allowable subject matter found in Claim 24, which is otherwise dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Claim 3 has been rewritten as an independent claim as suggested by the Office. A minor but obvious typographical error in Claim 2 was also corrected using the obvious correction. In this form, it is submitted that Claim 3 is allowable.

Claims 4-8 depend directly or indirectly upon Claim 3. When the recitations of Claims 4-8 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 3, it is submitted that Claims 4-8 are likewise allowable.

Claim 11 has been rewritten in independent form with essentially all of the features of Claim 10 incorporated therein. It is submitted that the coordinate system recited in Claim 10 is not essential for patentability of the newly independent Claim 10, because of the reasons given by the Office for the allowable subject matter in Claim 11.

Claim 16 has been rewritten as an independent claim as suggested by the Office. A minor but obvious typographical error in Claim 15 was also corrected using the obvious correction. In this form, it is submitted that Claim 16 is allowable.

Claims 17-21 depend directly or indirectly upon Claim 16. When the recitations of Claims 17-21 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 16, it is submitted that Claims 17-21 are likewise allowable.

Claim 24 has been rewritten in independent form with essentially all of the features of Claim 23 incorporated therein. It is submitted that the coordinate system recited in Claim 10 is not essential for patentability of the newly independent Claim 24, because of the reasons given by the Office for the allowable subject matter in Claim 24.

For the above reasons, it is requested that the objection to Claims to Claims 3-8, 11-13, and 16-21 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim be withdrawn.

New claim 27 corresponds to Claim 11 with all of the features of Claim 10 incorporated therein, and as such, is believed to be allowable.

New claim 28 is dependent upon Claim 11. When the recitations of Claim 28 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 11, it is submitted that Claim 28 is likewise allowable.

New claim 29 corresponds to Claim 24 with all of the features of Claim 23 incorporated therein, and as such, is believed to be allowable.

New claim 30 is dependent upon Claim 24. When the recitations of Claim 30 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 24, it is submitted that Claim 30 is likewise allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Alan L. Cassel
Registration No. 35,842
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740
(314) 621-5070